

#### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 7, 2003 (Paper No. 13). Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and following remarks are courteously requested.

Claims 60-67 are now pending in the application, with Claim 60 being the sole independent claim. Claims 36-59 have been canceled, and Claims 60-67 are newly presented herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 36-59 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,343,116 (Winsor '116), 5,818,164 (Winsor '164), 5,903,096 (Winsor '096), 6,218,776 (Cull et al.), and 5,602,444 (Jansma). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 60 relates to a lamp that includes an enclosure having a plurality of channels, and recites, *inter alia*, wherein each channel comprises  $n$  conjoined channel segments, wherein said plurality of channels are configured along  $m$  parallel paths that have at least one common end.

Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest at least the above-noted feature of newly presented independent Claim 60. The Office Action alleges that Winsor '116 discloses a single channel that includes seven conjoined channel segments configured along six parallel paths. It is unclear from FIG. 1, or the remainder of the disclosure for that matter, that, indeed, six parallel paths are disclosed. Nonetheless, even assuming *arguendo* that six parallel paths are disclosed, Winsor '116 does not disclose at least the above-noted feature of independent Claim 60. Namely, Winsor '116 does not disclose, or even remotely suggest, a plurality of channels configured along  $m$  parallel paths that have at least one common end, in which each of the channels comprises  $n$  conjoined channel segments. Applicants submit that, at best, what Winsor '116 discloses is a single channel having six conjoined channel segments.

The remaining citations, namely Winsor '164, Winsor '096, Cull et al., and Jansma, have been reviewed and are not believed to even remotely make up for the deficiency of Winsor '116.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claim 60 is patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims 61-67 are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to independent Claim 60, and because each recites features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2003

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz  
Reg. No. 45,254  
(480) 385-5060

Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz  
Customer No. 29906

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 24 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

BEST AVAILABLE COPY